

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-23, 26, and 29-32 are currently pending. Claims 12 and 25 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 30-32 have been added by the present response. The additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.¹

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 13-16, 18-21, 26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101608 to Whitmarsh, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0040692 to Matsueda et al. (hereinafter, “Matsueda”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0046065 to Furukawa et al. (hereinafter, “Furukawa”), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0026936 to Ouchi et al. (hereinafter, “Ouchi”); Claims 9, 10, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitmarsh, Matsueda, Furukawa, Ouchi, and Japanese Application Publication No. 2001-209503 to Shima; and Claims 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitmarsh, Matsueda, Furukawa, Ouchi, and U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0032761 to Aoyagi et al. (hereinafter, “Aoyagi”).

Claim 1 clarifies that the hardware resources, the applications, and the platform are included in a cabinet of the image forming apparatus. Further, Claim 1 clarifies that (A) the image forming apparatus includes the applications and platform, and (B) the image forming apparatus is separate from the client terminal to which the application of the image forming apparatus provides the screen data.

¹ See, e.g., page 24, line 23, page 25, line 15, and page 34, line 5 to page 35, line 2, in Applicants’ specification.

The Office Action acknowledges that any combination of Whitmarsh, Matsueda, and Furukawa fails to disclose the above claimed features.² Rather, the Office Action asserts that Buck discloses the above claimed features. Further, the Office Action asserts that Ouchi discloses that the claimed hardware resources, applications, and platform are included in a cabinet of the image forming apparatus, and that Ouchi demonstrates that these devices can be easily combined into a single device in Whitmarsh.³

Applicants respectfully traverse the above assertions in the Office Action for the following reasons.

Ouchi simply describes that a personal computer 36, a printer 34, a scanner 30, and a memory reader 32 can be integrated. Further, Ouchi describes that these devices are used locally in a LAB, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

On the other hand, as illustrated in Fig. 1 of Whitmarsh, the system of Whitmarsh is a distributed system including a remote publisher 18 and a remote print service 13 connected via a computer network 20.

The Office Action provides no support in Ouchi for the assertion that the *remote* publisher 18, the *remote* print service 13, and the computer network 20 can be integrated in a cabinet.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that any combination of Whitmarsh and Ouchi does **not** disclose or suggest the claimed features that the hardware resources, the applications, and the platform are included in a cabinet of the image forming apparatus, as recited in Claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that neither Matsueda nor Furukawa, alone or in combination, remedies the above deficiencies of Ouchi and Whitmarsh.

² See Office Action dated June 18, 2010, page 7.

³ Id.

The above discussion regarding independent Claim 1 also applies to independent Claims 14 and 29 because these claims recite features analogous to the features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent Claims 1, 14, and 29 be withdrawn. The dependent claims depending from independent Claims 1, 14, or 29 are patentable for at least the reasons the independent claims are patentable.

The present amendment adds Claims 30-32 for examination on the merits. No new matter has been added.⁴ It is respectfully submitted that the features of Claims 30-32 are not described in the art of record, and that these features should be considered and passed to allowance.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



James J. Kallaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Pranay K. Pattani
Registration No. 66,587

⁴ See, e.g., page 24, line 23, page 25, line 15, and page 34, line 5 to page 35, line 2, in Applicants' specification.